

it—a section. We asked people to look at corporate welfare. There is a lot in there. We talk about deductions and availability of certain things. There is a lot that exists. We have a tax proposal that is going to be submitted to us that calls for \$250 billion in tax cuts, the bulk of which will go to upper-income families. If we would just modify that by \$6 billion, I might add, or take a look at the literally billions of dollars that exist in corporate welfare and find \$6 billion in order to achieve this desirable goal of getting people to work, it seems to me to be a modest request. I am confident that people who are committed to this will be able to find the resources over the next 5 years to do so.

This ought to be, in my view, an issue which people can gather around. We may disagree on other aspects of this bill, but I do not believe there ought to be the kind of partisan debate over child care, over coming up with the resources to make it possible for people to go to work and have their kids well taken care of. That is an issue everybody understands. As I said a moment ago, anybody who is at work today and has young children understands the problem, the worry, the concern, the anxiety that people have.

Frankly, with all due respect to those who have made the proposal of 1 year or 5 years, you have a child that is 5 years and 6 months, or 6 years old, 7 years old, you are not going to leave that child home alone and go to work. That is just unrealistic.

In fact, even when those children are in school, the great anxiety that parents have at 2 or 3 o'clock in the afternoon is hoping the child gets home safely. Look at the number of phone calls that get made at 3:30 and 4 o'clock when people are at work to find out whether or not that young child has made it home, and then worrying when they are home what happens to them. Who is watching them? What are they doing?

Again, I have to believe most of my colleagues understand these issues because they have certainly heard the general worry and concern outside of the welfare debate when it comes to the issue of care for children. It's obviously compared to the other things we do—my God, we come up with criteria for parking places. We take care of people's cars better. We have criteria for pets in this country to make sure they are not going to get harmed. All I am saying is what about our kids? In this day and age, we just increased the defense budget by \$7 billion for next year, \$7 billion more than the Pentagon wanted. That is \$1 billion more than would take care of all the child care needs under the Dole bill for 5 years—for 5 years. One year of increased spending that was not asked for by the Pentagon.

In a just and fair society, with the tremendous and legitimate demand of the constituencies of this country that said we ought to get people off of wel-

fare and to work, understanding the element of child care, we ought to be able to do that. And this ought to be a unanimous vote. There ought to be no great split here on that issue, and that is what I am offering with this amendment.

We can have, over the weekend, a talk about it. Staffs may meet. Maybe somebody will have some other ideas how we can fashion this to the satisfaction of everyone. I am not rigidly holding onto every dotted "i" and crossed "t." If there are some other numbers people want to use, I am open to them. I am not looking for an acrimonious debate on this issue. I am just telling you flatout that a welfare reform bill that demands that people go to work and does not have a child care factor to it, an element to it to allow for that transition to occur, is just unworkable.

I promise that you can threaten families all you want, they are not going to abandon their children. They just will not do it. I do not care what income category, what part of the country you are talking about. These families are not going to walk out of the house and leave that child alone. We would condemn them if they did. You get arrested in parts of this country if you do it. We have had cases in Connecticut in recent times where people have gone to casinos and left children in parked cars. We arrest them. It is a headline story when it happens.

Does anyone think that we are going to have a law that requires that people go to work and leave their kids locked up in their houses, and that we are not going to have a sense of outrage about it? And we are then going to penalize those States because they have not met the criteria because people have refused to obey the law and leave their children alone? That is insanity. That does not make any sense at all.

So I do not know why people have so much difficulty with this concept. This ought to be a 20-minute debate, not a great source of controversy. If you do not understand the linkage between child care and welfare reform, then you do not have the vaguest notion about welfare and what needs to be done to make it work better.

So, Mr. President, I hope over the coming 2 or 3 days before we come back on Monday afternoon, that people will take a good look at this, come together, and see if we cannot either support this amendment or some modifications to it so it roughly will allow the Dole bill provisions to actually take effect and make it possible for these States to meet the criteria without raising taxes.

In the absence of doing it, you have the biggest unfunded mandate I have seen so far. It was S. 1, I think, the unfunded mandate bill, where we said you cannot put mandates on States without coming up with the resources so they do not have to raise their own taxes. Here we are going to have a mandate that you take your welfare recipients and put them to work or face

penalties. That is an unfunded mandate if we do not help them provide the resources to meet those criteria that we are laying out in this legislation.

So, Mr. President, again, I thank my colleagues for listening here this afternoon. I know I have probably bored them over the years on this subject matter, going back 7 and 8 years ago when we started the child care debates. But I think most people recognize today—certainly the corporate community does. The business community has had tremendous sophistication in understanding its employees' needs. They understanding the value of productive workers and having good, adequate child care alleviates worries so those employees can pay full attention to their jobs. Every sector of our society seems to appreciate the relationship between people's worries about their children, the priorities that people place on their children and their children's needs and the simultaneous need to be a productive and successful worker.

As we now talk about getting people off public assistance and moving them into the work force for the benefit of everyone, most importantly that individual, the element of dealing with their young children is something that we have to take into consideration.

I think exempting the families, as appealing as that may be to some, confuses the issue rather than sticking to the point of trying to make it possible for people to get to work and help them stay there through an adequate and appropriate child care system or structure.

So with that, Mr. President I urge my colleagues to take a look at this. We will reengage the debate on Monday and hopefully come up with an adequate solution that will make it possible for all of us to begin to support the DOLE proposal on welfare reform.

I know, in speaking with others, that the administration is very interested in supporting a bill that will truly be a welfare reform bill. That is the strong desire of President Clinton. He wants to do it. He believes that can be done if an issue like this can be adequately addressed and several others. But this is certainly an important element in all of that.

With that, I thank my colleagues and I yield the floor.

#### SENATOR PACKWOOD'S RESIGNATION EFFECTIVE AS OF OCTOBER 1, 1995

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there have been a number of inquiries last night and today about when the resignation of Senator PACKWOOD would be effective. I think I can best answer that in the exchange of letters I have had with Senator PACKWOOD if my colleagues will permit me.

This is my letter to Senator PACKWOOD:

DEAR BOB: As I said on the Senate floor yesterday, it is my belief that you made the

right and honorable decision to resign from the United States Senate.

I believe that it is in the best interests of the Senate and of the State of Oregon to reach closure on this matter as soon as possible.

Therefore, it is my recommendation that your resignation become effective no later than October 1, 1995. I would further recommend that you relinquish the Chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Finance effective today.

I know of your deep concern for your personal and committee staff, and I will work to provide them with an appropriate period of time to complete their own transition.

Sincerely,

BOB DOLE.

This is Senator PACKWOOD's reply:

DEAR BOB: I hereby tender my resignation as of October 1, 1995. I also am relinquishing today, Friday, September 8, my chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Finance.

I appreciate very much your concern and willingness to help the Personal and Committee staff in having an appropriate period of time to complete their own transition.

Thanks so much.

Sincerely,

BOB PACKWOOD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER,

Washington, DC, September 8, 1995.

Senator BOB PACKWOOD,  
259 Russell, Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: As I said on the Senate floor yesterday, it is my belief that you made the right and honorable decision to resign from the United States Senate.

I believe that it is in the best interests of the Senate and of the State of Oregon to reach closure on this matter as soon as possible.

Therefore, it is my recommendation that your resignation become effective no later than October 1, 1995. I would further recommend that you relinquish the Chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Finance effective today.

I know of your deep concern for your personal and committee staff, and I will work to provide them with an appropriate period of time to complete their own transition.

Sincerely,

BOB DOLE.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, September 8, 1995.

Hon. BOB DOLE,  
Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: I hereby tender my resignation as of October 1, 1995. I also am relinquishing today, Friday, September 8, my chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Finance.

I appreciate very much your concern and willingness to help the Personal and Committee staff in having an appropriate period of time to complete their own transition.

Thanks so much.

Sincerely,

BOB PACKWOOD.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I think that answers any questions anybody may have had.

#### FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. I am delighted to have this opportunity to make a few remarks and to offer two amendments to the Dole modified amendment for the welfare reform proposal.

Mr. President, the Dole modified amendment which is offered today is a substantial improvement, a very substantial and significant step toward the right kind of operation in terms of reforming welfare. I am pleased to see that the mechanism for delivering block grants—which was first recommended in the proposal I made on welfare reform called CIVIC, Senate bills 842, 843, 844 and 845, the proposal for delivering block grants directly from the Department of the Treasury to the States—is included and that will vastly reduce the Federal welfare bureaucracy, which I considered to be a bureaucratic tax upon the poor, and make resources available to the truly needy. It should limit Washington's interference in the States' welfare reform efforts.

As I have spoken many times on the floor, ending the micromanagement and intermeddling involvement of HHS to the extent possible, and giving States the opportunity to craft and shape welfare reform so that it meets the needs of the people in the States, is very important. We do need to replace the failed system of welfare which has been a Washington-run system, and the modified amendment proposed by Senator DOLE would help achieve this, in part, by adopting the proposal which is for direct block grants to the States that bypass much of the redtape of Washington.

Also, it is important that the Dole amendment includes an independent audit provision which will eliminate much of the Washington micromanagement and prevent funds from being consumed needlessly on bureaucratic oversight. Under this provision, States would supply to the Department of the Treasury audits conducted by independent auditors demonstrating their compliance and that block grant funds have been used properly in serving the needy populations.

I want to also say how pleased I am to see that the modified amendment includes a provision adapted from my welfare reform bill, which recognizes that Government programs alone will never solve all of our welfare needs. We have to allow States to involve a number of nongovernmental charitable organizations, including faith-based organizations, in serving the poor. Organizations like the Salvation Army and Boys and Girls Clubs are often more successful in serving people in need than are governmental institutions. We need to be able to tap these resources effectively. There is a character in the programs like the Boys and Girls Clubs and the Salvation Army that is important in meeting needs. It is a character associated with charity, which provides for a kind of compassion and caring that instills hope and aspiration in the lives of people.

The modified amendment includes very important provisions in this respect, which will ensure that such organizations that are selected to participate in meeting the needs of the poor are not forced to compromise their character. Furthermore, any person eligible for assistance who would be offended by going to one of these organizations to receive assistance would have an opportunity to receive alternative services from the state. There have been clear guidelines set to protect individual rights and to protect the rights of the organization.

While these are important provisions included in the modified Dole amendment, Mr. President, the modified amendment still I think needs adjustment and falls short of being a comprehensive welfare reform bill.

That is why I intend to send a pair of amendments to the desk which would broaden the bill to include block grants for two major welfare programs: Food stamps and supplemental security income, or the SSI program.

Block grants are essential for these programs because if you leave welfare partially open ended as entitlement programs, and partially block granted, there is a tendency on the part of jurisdictions to shift the welfare caseload from the areas which are block granted to the areas that are open ended and entitlements.

As a result, rather than controlling and managing welfare effectively, you just push from one area of the welfare population to another, move people from AFDC over to SSI. In some cases, that move would be far more expensive.

A single child on SSI gets \$448 a month. There are AFDC programs which provide \$200 or \$300 a month, and a shift in that population would not be a reform at all in terms of cost containment, but a way of just dramatically increasing our welfare costs. As a matter of fact, it would make it very difficult for us to control costs.

In addition, when you have a program which has no limit on it, totally entitlement and totally federally funded, the incentives on the part of State and local instrumentalities to combat fraud and abuse are low. If we give the items in block grants to the States, the incentive to contain fraud and abuse, to detect it, to root it out of the system, is elevated.

Mr. President, fraud and abuse are rampant in the Food Stamp Program and SSI today because as the rolls grow, the money flows. There is no incentive to the welfare industry to reduce the problem. The only way we will be able to combat fraud and abuse is to give States the ability to design and enforce these programs and the incentive for them to limit the expenditures in these programs. I intend to send two amendments to the desk regarding SSI and food stamps.

Finally, Mr. President, I join today Senator COATS in introducing an